

# HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XX

APRIL, 1927

NUMBER 2

## A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS (MICHIGAN PAPYRUS 44-H)

CAMPBELL BONNER  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Two years ago I presented in this REVIEW (vol. XVIII, 1925, pp. 115-127) a preliminary account of the papyrus codex, containing a large part of the Similitudes of Hermas, which belongs to the University of Michigan collection (P Mich 917). The complete publication of that text has been greatly delayed by the demands of other duties; and now the importance of a more recent discovery obliges me to turn aside from the larger task in order to bring to the attention of scholars a new fragment, which may be the oldest extant portion of Hermas' work.

When the first large lot of papyri was acquired for the University of Michigan in 1921, the experts of the Manuscript Department of the British Museum, especially Mr. C. T. Lamacraft, laid us under heavy obligations by assuming the tedious task of damping out, relaxing, and cleaning the pieces of papyrus, which were often folded, twisted, and stuck together. All the larger pieces in the lot were treated in this way, but a considerable number of small scraps remained which did not seem to justify the expenditure of labor upon them at that time. This rubbish was sent over in two small tin boxes, and but for a fortunate circumstance the pieces might have lain undisturbed for a long time, since our small group of workers was occupied to the limit of their available time in preparing the larger texts for publication.

Early last year it occurred to Professor Frank E. Robbins to search through these scraps in order to see whether any of them

belonged to an important, though fragmentary, astrological roll which he was then editing (see *Classical Philology*, XXII, pp. 1 ff.). In this hope he was disappointed. Upon straightening out the unpromising-looking fragments, he found little of interest except some specimens of unusual types of writing. One fragment, however, he observed to be a Christian text, and he brought it to my attention on the chance that it might prove to be a part of the Shepherd. Such in fact it was. Within a few minutes we were able to identify it as a portion of the end of Mandate ii and the opening words of Mandate iii. Professor Robbins has generously turned his find over to me for study and publication. It has been inserted in our inventory with the number 44-H.

The fragment is irregular in shape, the greatest height being 12.1 cm., the greatest breadth 8.7 cm. Except for a projection at the top, its size is roughly that of the palm of a man's hand. The material is a fairly good papyrus, originally well smoothed (at least on the recto side), thin, and of light color. On the recto side are the ends of some entries which probably belong to a tax register, of which very little can be made out. This is partly due to the fact that the writer used his papyrus freely, leaving considerable space between lines, so that there is really very little on this side; and partly because some gummy substance adheres to portions of the surface so closely that when it is removed it takes the writing along with it. The word *αιγιαλοῦ* ('shore-land') occurs, and is of importance as showing that the papyrus came from the Fayum. The writing is of the latter part of the second century after Christ. Professor A. S. Hunt, who has given me the benefit of his valuable opinion, thinks that it may be assigned approximately to the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

The writing of the verso is an upright hand, semi-cursive rather than literary, not very regular yet not unsteady. I did not venture at first to think of a date earlier than the third century; but continued study of the hand, taken in connection with dated documents, forces me to the conclusion that it is nearer to the style of the second century than to that of the third. It is a pleasure to find that Professor Hunt concurs in

this opinion. I think that the verso writing may be assigned to about 200 A.D.

The plates accompanying this paper make minute description of the writing unnecessary, but attention may be drawn to a few points. The eta is of the h-shape, with the first stroke rather tall. The horizontal forms a sharp angle with the last stroke, which descends from it in a pronounced curve turning up towards the right. A similar curve is seen in the last stroke of pi. Rho and phi extend well below the line, and the downward stroke is straight. Upsilon branches rather widely and extends little if at all below the line. One upsilon (line 8) is quite small, and has its stem curved up sharply to the right; and a tendency towards this turn to the right may be seen in one or two other instances. Omicron is of medium size; the breadth generally exceeds the height. Sigma is nearly closed, and the top is usually flat. In some cases this flat top is greatly prolonged in order to fill out unused space — a common device. In one certain case sigma is a rather narrow, downward-facing curve like an inverted U, and its top is linked by a horizontal stroke to the following letter (line 6). This is also the explanation, as I think, of the tau-like form at the beginning of line 1. A noteworthy feature of this hand is its use of a hook or starting-stroke in the uprights. This is very marked in some examples of iota and eta, and is seen even in the last stroke of nu.

A single sign, a short horizontal stroke, seems to do duty for both breathings and for the acute accent. In one or two cases it is brought into contact with the top of a letter in such a manner as almost to escape observation. In line 3 it serves as acute accent over omicron, in line 4 as smooth breathing with the conjunction  $\eta$ , in lines 5, 10, and 11 as rough breathing with the feminine article  $\eta$ , and again as rough breathing over  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  in lines 5 and 7, where it is not easily detected.

Apropos of this sign, Professor Sanders calls my attention to the fact that the Berlin papyrus of Genesis uses a fairly long horizontal stroke for the sign of abbreviation, for the rough breathing, and for both circumflex and grave accents. Further, this stroke sometimes replaces the usual sign (a downward-curving stroke) as apostrophe after proper names ending in a con-

sonant (see University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, vol. XXI, p. 239).

In lines 7 and 12 a dot is placed upon the base line. In the former of these two instances, it might be regarded as a minor punctuation, but in the latter that is hardly possible. In both cases it occurs between words the first of which ends, while the second begins, with a vowel. Can this dot be a device to separate concurrent vowels? Thompson (Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography, p. 62) mentions a similar use of the apostrophe, but does not make it clear at what periods it is found. In the one case where initial iota occurs, it has two dots above it.

In line 7,  $\theta\epsilon\omega$  is written without abbreviation. No other cases of sacred names occur; but if  $\kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\omicron\nu$  occurred in the mutilated first sentence, as in the other texts, it must have been abbreviated.

The writing consists of the first sixteen lines of one column, and the first letters of six lines (4-9) of a second column. A small portion of the upper margin has been preserved, enough to prove that line 1 was really the first of the page. It does not seem possible to determine the original height of the column, since the remaining letters of column 2 afford no sufficient clue. Speculation as to the original length of the roll is also scarcely worth while. Our text was written on the verso of a discarded document, and since the hand is not a practised book-hand, it may be that only a few chapters were copied for the writer's personal use. Since, however, the Michigan codex shows that some good copies contained only the Mandates and Similitudes together with Vision v, the introduction to the Mandates, we may imagine that the writer of our fragment had before him the modest aim of copying only the Mandates, which might have been contained in a roll of moderate length. Regarding this matter, I may refer to page 118 of my previous article, and to Professor Lake's remarks on page 280 of the same volume of this REVIEW.

As to the manner in which the lost portions have been restored, it may be observed that in lines 4 to 11 inclusive there can be little doubt about the lost letters. Line 7 has lost only

two letters at the left margin, the others have lost three; and three seem sufficient to fill out the left side of lines 1-3. It is harder to deal with the right side of lines 1 and 2. If we compare these lines with 3, it appears that eleven letters are to be supplied at the right of line 1, and that about ten should be restored between ἐγένετο and the last letter of line 2, an alpha. But since the whole fragment shows considerable irregularity in the breadth of the single letters as well as of the whole column of writing, certainty is not to be hoped for.

## COLUMN 1

- [αθω]ος εστιν [ως ελαβε παρα  
 [κυ] εγενετο η [διακονεια] α  
 [πλο]υσιωτητι μη διακριναν  
 [τος] τινι δωσιν η μη δωσιν  
 5 [εγε]νετο η διακονεια απλως  
 [τελ]εσθεισα ενδοξος παρα  
 [τω] θεω. ω[s ο]υτως απλως  
 [δια]κονουντος φυλασσει ουν  
 [ταυ]την την εντολην ην  
 10 [σοι] εδωκα ινα η μεταν[οια  
 [σου] και η του οικου σο[υ εν α  
 [πλουσιο]τητι. ευρεθη κα  
 [θαρα κ]αι ακακ[ος] και α[μι  
 [αντο]s  
 15 [ ]ε[ν]τολη[  
 παλιν λεγει μοι[

## COLUMN 2

- λ[  
 το[  
 τ.[  
 μ[  
 5 τ[  
 α[

In the Athos manuscript the corresponding passage (Mandate ii. 6-7) reads as follows:

ὁ οὖν διδοὺς ἀθῶός ἐστιν· ὡς γὰρ ἔλαβεν παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τὴν διακονίαν ἐτ[έλε]σε μὴ διακρίνων τί δῶ. ἐγένετο οὖν ἡ διακονία αὕτη ἀπλῶς τελεσθεῖσα ἐνδοξος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. ὁ οὖν οὕτως ἀ[πλῶς] διακονῶν τῷ θεῷ ζήσεται. φύλασσε οὖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην ὡς σοι λελάληκα, ἵνα ἡ μετάνοιά σου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου σου ἐν ἀπλότῃ εὐρεθῇ καὶ ἀκ[ακία] καθαρά καὶ ἀμίαντος.

This is the transcript made by Professor Lake to accompany his facsimile of the Athos leaves. In one particular I venture to suggest that it should be corrected. The word which he gives as ἀκ[ακία] stands at an upper right-hand margin, so that there is no doubt that there would have been room for ἄκακος and the abbreviation for καί. This would agree, except for a change in the order of words, with the text of the papyrus. Further, I am all but certain not only that there was room for the suggested reading, but also that enough of it can be actually read to justify our adopting it. With Professor Lake's permission, and with the kind assistance of Professor C. H. Turner and the Librarian of Magdalen College, Oxford, I have been enabled to obtain new prints from Professor Lake's original negatives. By examining them with a powerful glass I make out ἄκακος and the tail of the abbreviation of καί.

The first complete sentence of this passage is quite different in the Sinaiticus, reading ὡς γὰρ ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ κυ τὴν διακονίαν τελέσαι ἀπλῶς αὐτὴν ἐτέλεσεν μηθὲν διακρίνων τίνι δῶ ἢ μὴ δῶ. From there through ζήσεται it agrees with Athous; but after that word the Sinaiticus is mutilated, and nothing remains of this passage but the last two syllables of ἀμίαντος.

The versions also show that from a very early period the text of this passage was far from settled. In the Old Latin, it reads thus:

Qui autem dat innocens erit, sicut enim accepit a domino ministerium consummavit, nihil dubitando cui daret, cui non daret. et fecit hoc ministerium simpliciter gloriosum ad deum. custodi ergo mandatum hoc, sicut tibi locutus sum, ut paenitentia tua simplex inveniatur et possit domui tuae bene fieri, et cor mundum habe.

This is the text which has been established by Professor Turner for his new edition of the Old Latin Hermas. He has

with great generosity allowed me the use of a provisional draught of his text, not only in this passage but also in the portions covered by the Michigan codex, where I have consulted it with great advantage to my own work. Hilgenfeld reads *dare* (bis) and *glorioso*.

The Palatine version reads:

Ille autem qui dat innoxius erit, cum enim hoc ministerium, quod a domino accipitur, simpliciter apud deum gestum fuerit. quicumque ergo tam simpliciter ministrat, vivit deo. custodi itaque mandatum hoc, sicut tibi dixi, ut poenitentia tua et domus tuae cum simplicitate, et cor tuum sit mundum et indeficiens apud deum.

This is the emended text as it appears in the edition of Gebhardt and Harnack. The readings of the manuscript itself need not concern us, since they throw no light upon the relation of this text to the others. But even in this emended form it is not free from corruptions, and gives clear testimony as to the general confusion which existed in the early texts.

In the Ethiopic version also there are manifest corruptions, as its editor observed; the Latin translation of it is as follows:

Is autem qui dedit innocens erit, quia dominus ut ministerium faciat ita fecit, idque simplici corde, non secum distinguens nec dicens, huic dabo et illi non dabo. et ministerium eius factum est honoratum apud dominum, quia simpliciter egit et quia simplici corde ministravit domino et vixit. custodi igitur hoc mandatum sicut locutus sum tibi, ut sit vobis poenitentia et vestri et domus tuae, idque in simplicitate et puritate sine immunditia.

Some discussion of details of the text of the Michigan fragment seems to be needed before we can proceed to any conclusions about its character and value.

Line 1. The traces before *ἐστιν* look like tau; but that letter could have occurred here only by some slip in writing, such as a dittography, *εστεστιν*. Furthermore, the top of tau in this fragment is generally horizontal, whereas in this form there is a downward curve at the left. It is all but certain that we have here, first, a part of omicron, the top and left side, and then a sigma of the same cursive type which appears again in line 5 — a downward-facing curve like inverted U, of which only the right side is well preserved — connected by a horizontal stroke to the following epsilon. The ‘tumbledown’ sigma is well known

in papyri of the second century (Kenyon, *Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, pp. 44-45).

The first words of the sentence beginning after *ἔστιν* appear in Athous and Sinaiticus as *ὡς γὰρ ἔλαβε(ν) παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου*, which is too long for the available space, even if the sacred name was abbreviated. Since *κν* was probably written broadly, I prefer to place those two letters, rather than four, at the left of line 2, and leave for line 1 the eleven letters *ὡς ἐλαβε παρα*. To write either the conjunction or the article would necessitate an encroachment upon the right margin, which is less likely to have occurred in the first line than farther down the column. As to the omission of *γάρ*, it may be observed that laxity in sentence-connection is a marked characteristic of the Michigan codex, and that *οὖν* is omitted from line 5 below.

The filling of the lacuna at the right of line 2 depends upon the reading of the left side of line 3. There it is evident that we have to do, not with the correct form *ἀπλότητι*, but with the extraordinary, not to say monstrous, *ἀπλουσιότητι*, for which I find no example elsewhere, but which seems to have been suggested to the writer by the comparative and superlative *ἀπλούστερος*, *ἀπλούστατος*. Any doubt that this well-nigh incredible form was actually used should be removed by a careful examination of the enlarged photograph (Plate II). Iota before omicron is certain, and the sigma, though injured by a perforation, is quite legible. Of upsilon there remain the bottom of the stem and the right fork. For a reason which will presently appear, I assign to the beginning of this line only *πλο*.

Turning again to line 2, we find after *ἐγένετο* the bottom of a vertical stroke which reaches a little lower than the neighboring letters and is almost certainly part of eta. Then followed *διακονεία*, and there are traces which correspond very well, both in their position and in their form, to the bottoms of nu, epsilon, and iota. Of the final alpha of this noun there remains only a part of the last stroke, which runs over to, and touches, the complete alpha which stands at the very end of the line. In spite of the temptation to take this last alpha for the end of *διακονεία*, I think it must be the first letter of *ἀπλουσιότητι*, from which it follows that the dative was not preceded by *ἐν*.

Any other restoration of this line seems to me to be excluded, first by measurement of the space, secondly by the forms of the bottoms of the mutilated letters, and finally by the fact that neither *nu* nor *iota* would be linked on to this last *alpha* by such a stroke as is visible. The omission of *ἐν* is indeed surprising in view of Hermas's own usage, to say nothing of the usage of the New Testament in such phrases. It may be, and probably is, only an error; but there are some strange-looking instances of a dative of manner without preposition (compare John 11, 14; 1 Cor. 10, 30, Schmid, *Atticismus*, IV, p. 616, and a case which Schmid cites from Pap. Leid. V, 8, 27).

Line 3. The peculiar twist that is given to this sentence by the use of *ἐγένετο* and the shift from an active to a virtually passive construction is further emphasized by *διακρίναντος*. This word was probably felt as a genitive absolute rather than as dependent upon *διακονεία*; for Hermas shared with the New Testament writers and with others of his time the habit of employing the genitive absolute irregularly. Compare Vis. i. 1, 3; ii. 1, 1; v. 4; also Robertson, *Grammar*, pp. 513 and 1131, and Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 107, n. 5.

Line 4. To the other sources for the text of this passage may be added the not very valuable testimony of Antiochus (*Hom.* 98, col. 1732 Migne). He gives the double indirect question in the form *τίνι δῶ ἢ τίνι μὴ δῶ*. Thus far I have found no parallel in the period of Hermas for the use of *δῶσιν*, singular, which the papyrus presents here. Homer's use of *δῶσι* is of course well known.

Line 5. Attention has been called above to the omission of *οὖν* after *ἐγένετο*.

Line 7. The clause *ὡς οὕτως ἀπλῶς διακονοῦντος*, which may either be referred back to *διακονεία* in line 5 or treated as another case of the extended use of the genitive absolute, presents a reading quite different from Athous and Sinaiticus, which agree in giving *ὁ οὖν οὕτως ἀπλῶς διακονῶν τῷ θεῷ ζήσεται*. Antiochus has *καὶ οὕτως ἀπλῶς διακονῶν θεῷ ζήσεται*. It is to be observed that L<sup>1</sup> did not translate *ζήσεται*. The whole clause may have been absent from that translator's copy; but since in the form given by the Michigan fragment it is tautologous, it

is quite possible that the original of L<sup>1</sup> agreed with the papyrus, and that the translator deliberately omitted the redundant words.

Equally strange is the situation in the Palatine version (L<sup>2</sup>). This translator shows no knowledge of the infinitive of purpose *τελέσαι* which is found in the Sinaiticus, nor of the clause which appears in that manuscript as *μηθὲν διακρίνων τίνι δῶ ἢ μὴ δῶ*. Perhaps this may be explained by assuming that the Palatine translator had before him (as in the Michigan fragment, line 2) *ἐγένετο ἡ διακονεία* instead of *ἐτέλεσε* or *αὐτὴν ἐτέλεσεν*, and that he passed from this, misled by the recurrence of *ἐγένετο* in line 5, directly to *ἀπλῶς τελεσθεῖσα κ.τ.λ.*, where, however, he omitted *ἐνδοξος*. On such a supposition his text might be reconstructed as follows: *ὥς γὰρ ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἐγένετο ἡ διακονεία, ἀπλῶς τελεσθεῖσα παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*. This is mere hypothesis; but I can see no more likely explanation of the facts.

Lines 8–10. Here the Sinaiticus fails us. Apart from the unimportant variant in the position of *ταύτην*, it will be noted that the papyrus stands alone in presenting *ἦν σοι ἔδωκα* instead of *ὥς σοι λελάληκα*, which was read by all other authorities. The former reading is at least as good as the latter; compare Sim. v. 5, 3 with viii. 6, 6.

Lines 11–14. The repetition of the article in line 11, as if to support the dependent genitive *τοῦ οἴκου*, is probably rare in all periods of Greek literature. Grammarians cite Isocrates 2, 4, *πότερόν ἐστιν ἄξιον ἐλέσθαι τὸν βίον τὸν τῶν ιδιωτευνόντων μὲν, ἐπικῶς δὲ πραπτόντων, ἢ τὸν τῶν τυραννεύοντων*; and Plato, Epist. 8, p. 354 E, *μετρία ἢ θεῷ δουλεία, ἅμετρος δὲ ἢ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*. In line 12 *ἀπλουσιότητι* has been restored, not only for conformity with line 3 but also because it fills the available space better than *ἀπλότῃτι*. After *εὔρεθῇ*, the original of L<sup>1</sup> seems to have been either corrupt or quite different. I find no ready explanation for the words *et possit domui tuae bene fieri*, nor can I account for the omission in L<sup>2</sup> of a word corresponding to *εὔρεθῇ*.

The last clause again reveals considerable confusion in the text. L<sup>2</sup> ignores *ἄκακος*, L<sup>1</sup> both *ἄκακος* and *ἀμίαντος*. Athous had, as I think, *καὶ ἄκακος καὶ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος*, thus showing only a difference in word-order as compared with the papyrus

fragment. The Ethiopic translator read ἐν ἀπλότητι, also, probably, καθαρά καὶ ἀμίαντος. The seat of corruption appears to be the word ἄκακος, which had disappeared from the original of the Ethiopic translation, and which, it may be, became so illegible in certain copies as to be replaced by ἡ καρδία — whence *cor* in the Latin versions. Now that the evidence of the new fragment is joined to that of the Athos manuscript, there can no longer be any reason for introducing ἡ καρδία into an edition of the Greek text, as Gebhardt and Harnack did. It must be remembered of course that they had only Simonides' copy of the Athos leaves, and that it is particularly bad in this passage.

Line 15. The right-hand side of the papyrus is torn away after ἐ[ν]τολή. Under the last letter of this word there is a horizontal stroke, which is nearer to this line than to line 16. Professor Sanders has shown me, in the Washington papyrus codex of the Minor Prophets, headings which are framed in, as it were, by horizontal strokes.

It is not easy to state definite conclusions as to the worth of the text offered by this fragment; but it would be a serious error simply to dismiss it as a 'wild' text. Its vulgarisms and its awkwardly constructed, asyndetic sentences may be regarded, with some reason, as evidence of its freedom from tampering; for there is little doubt that there was a tendency gradually to weed out faults in grammar and style (see this REVIEW, XVIII, p. 127). Nothing in this fragment is worse than παθοῦνται (apparently for πᾶσχοι), which is read in Sim. viii. 10, 4, in the only extant Greek source, the carefully copied Michigan codex. The Athos manuscript is corrupt at that point, and has probably omitted a few words.

It becomes especially important that we should not pass too lightly over the strange text of this fragment when we reflect that of the other sources for this passage no two agree nearly enough to give an harmonious account of the original text, and that not one is free from corruption, manifest or probable. The mutilated Sinaiticus is most nearly free from suspicion. But does not its version of the sentence beginning ὥς γὰρ ἔλαβε owe something of its clarity to the hand of a redactor? Its

τελέσαι is not represented in the translations, and we must allow for the possibility that it is either a dittography for ἐτέλεσε (since αι and ε tended to converge in pronunciation), or that it was added in order to make the meaning more explicit. On the whole, it seems reasonable to expect that the text of the new fragment will take its place, *par inter pares*, among the all too scanty sources of our text. Its age alone — not more than two generations later than the generally accepted date of Hermas — entitles it to respectful consideration.

When we study the peculiar character of this text, and remember that it is apparently the oldest extant part of any writing that was ever held to belong to the canon of sacred scripture, it is impossible not to view with some doubt the efforts of scholars to arrive at an 'original' or verbally 'primitive' text of those writings. There are many indications that for a certain period in the history of the church the scribes who copied even writings which were held sacred freely exercised the privilege of making grammatical and stylistic corrections. More and more heed is being given to the voices of those investigators who are rehabilitating the once despised 'Western' text of the New Testament — whereby, I take it, they mean the text of the second and the third century, as represented not only by other evidence but also by early papyrus fragments. Perhaps we have in the Michigan codex and in the new fragment a partial picture of something like a 'Western' text of Hermas — a text of the second and early third centuries, full of vulgarisms and irregularities, liable not only to correction, but also to less excusable alterations prompted by the mere whim of the copyist, and very far indeed from the standardized text which was produced in the days of the triumph of the church, and which is represented for us by the manuscript of Mount Athos.

## MANICHAISM AND AUGUSTINE'S IDEA OF 'MASSA PERDITIONIS'

E. BUONAIUTI

UNIVERSITY OF ROME

IN my essay, "The Genesis of St. Augustine's Idea of Original Sin," published in this REVIEW (1917, pp. 159-175), I advanced the theory that Augustine's doctrine of original sin and its transmission was not derived from the teaching of Ambrose, as Harnack holds, but rather from the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans by the unknown writer commonly referred to as Ambrosiaster. From this fourth-century writer Augustine borrowed his final formulation of the doctrine of the universal participation of mankind in the sin of Adam and his interpretation of the most discussed passages of the Epistle to the Romans, as well as the notions of man "servus culpae" and "servus gratiae." The influence of Ambrose has nothing to do with this teaching of Augustine, and in general the positive and realistic method of biblical exegesis found in Augustine's "Tractatus in Paulum" is very different from the method of the "Enarrationes" of Ambrose, while on the contrary it shows striking coincidences with the commentary of Ambrosiaster.

In his book on Julianus of Aeclanum, Bruckner had already called attention to evident analogies between the Augustinian doctrine and certain definite Manichaean premises. Developing further Bruckner's suggestion, I pointed out that there is a close relation between Manichaean anthropology and Augustine's soteriology as finally formulated by him during the Pelagian controversy; but the main purpose of my paper was to show that the influence of Ambrosiaster was what led Augustine from the path of Platonic speculation and allegorical exegesis, in which he had followed Origen and Ambrose, to the new path of a realistic conception of human nature and to the literal exegesis of the Antiochian school. The peculiar coincidence of the word 'massa' used with the same meaning by both Augus-

tine and Ambrosiaster seemed to me a clear evidence of the dependence of the former upon the latter.<sup>1</sup>

A further inquiry on this point, assisted by the recent discoveries of new Manichaean sources, has strengthened my conviction that Augustine's anthropology owes much more than is commonly thought to the Manichaean system which he had followed in his youth. It seems to me that when Augustine borrowed from Ambrosiaster the term 'massa,' and adopted this characteristic figure of speech to express human solidarity in sin, this term itself led him back to a fundamental notion with which he had become familiar in the days of his Manichaean initiation. Our spiritual life is often influenced by images and symbols more than by abstract conceptions, and even with the strongest minds theories and doctrines absorbed in the period of youth are bound to leave deep traces in the whole development of individual thought.

A brief survey of the use of the technical term 'massa,' in its Greek equivalent ἡ βῶλος, 'lump,' in the Manichaean sources and in Augustine will throw much light on my assumption. It is not here the place to discuss the question whether Mani knew Greek or whether he used Greek words in his writings. But there is no doubt that in the formulation of his anthropological and eschatological system he used the concept expressed metaphorically by the word βῶλος. The evidence is to be found in the writings of St. Ephrem. In his "Ad Hypatium adversus haereses" the Syriac writer outlines, in order to refute it, Mani's anthropological dualism, and mentions a point of detail of the Manichaean system in the following passage:

How do they say that some of those souls who sin much and do much wickedness and blaspheme much and are guilty of great unbelief, those that are found like dregs in the midst of that which they call Bolos, — as they say that when the Fire dissolves all, into the midst of it is gathered everything which is mixed and mingled in created things from the Lights, and those souls which have done much wickedness are assigned to the realm of the darkness when it is tormented?<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Souter (Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul: Introduction, 1922, p. 178) fully agrees with my conclusions, and thinks that the concurrent use of the term 'massa' in both Ambrosiaster and Augustine is very significant.

<sup>2</sup> C. W. Mitchell, S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan,

That the word 'Bolos' in Ephrem's text was a technical term taken literally from the Syriac Manichæan sources is confirmed also by the fact that we find it again in a similar clause of the Syriac version of the treatise against the Manichæans of Titus of Bostra.<sup>3</sup> This coincidence receives further light from certain passages of the *Acta Archelai*.<sup>4</sup> As is well known, Hegemonius, or whoever was the author of the *Acta*, is the first Christian writer who deals with Mani's writings. The word 'Bolos' occurs twice in Epiphanius's quotations from the Greek original of the *Acta*. The first instance (c. 13) is in the conclusion of the exposition of the Manichæan system outlined by Turbon and precisely in the eschatological description of the final destiny of the wicked souls and of the world. According to this passage Mani taught that in the last day the Omophoros will forsake the world and thus the great conflagration will begin by which the whole cosmos shall be destroyed. At the same time the Omophoros will deliver the Bolos to the new Aeon so that the wicked souls shall be bound forever.<sup>5</sup> The second mention of Bolos is found in the same eschatological description when mention is made of the destiny of those who have believed in the prophets inspired by the evil spirit and it is said that they shall perish forever conjoined with matter,

transcribed from the palimpsest B. M. Add. 14623. I. The Discourses addressed to Hypatius, 1912, p. lxxii. Mitchell's suggestion that βῶλος was a faulty transcription for διάβολος has been rightly rejected by Burkitt in the second volume of the same series, *The Discourse of Domnus*, 1921, pp. cxxxviii ff. and p. 236. Cf. also Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees*, 1925, pp. 65 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in cod. Hamburgensi servata sunt graece ed. P. A. de Lagarde, 1859, p. 41. In this passage Titus of Bostra speaks of Mani as saying (λέγων) that the wicked souls must ἐν τῇ βῶλῳ ἐμπαγήσασθαι ἅμα τῇ κακίᾳ. Burkitt comments on this statement: "The wicked soul is thus turned into a literal villain, ascriptus glebae" (p. 65, n. 1). The Syriac version, made before 411, merely transliterates βῶλος in bōlārā.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by C. H. Beeson in the Berlin corpus, 1906. See his *Einleitung*, pp. xiii-xvi, also Alfarc, *Les Écritures Manichéennes*, I, p. 112.

<sup>5</sup> ἐπὶ τέλει λέγει . . . τότε ὁ Ὀμφορός ἀφίησιν ἔξω τὴν γῆν, καὶ οὕτως ἀπολύεται τὸ μέγα πῦρ καὶ ὅλον ἀναλίσκει τὸν κόσμον· εἶτα πάλιν ἀφίησι τὸν βῶλον μετὰ τοῦ νέου αἰῶνος, ὅπως πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν δεθῶσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Beeson, p. 21). The Latin version substitutes 'animam' for βῶλον. On the Omophoros and its historical and religious parallels see Cumont, *Recherches sur le Manichéisme*, Bruxelles, 1908, Fasc. I, Appendix II.

a mass of misery and ignorance consigned to perdition in the day of the final dissolution of the world.<sup>6</sup>

But the most important point for my special purpose is the fact, not noticed by others, that in the Latin version of the *Acta* the Greek term *Bolos* is translated by 'massa,' which came to assume in Latin theological language after Ambrosiaster and Augustine a technical meaning parallel to the meaning of *Bolos* in Manichaean theology.<sup>7</sup>

In the Augustinian circle this Manichaean doctrine of the thick amalgam of matter and darkness to which the wicked soul would be glued forever, was a common notion. One of Augustine's closest friends, Evodius of Uzalis,<sup>8</sup> speaks explicitly of it in his short treatise against the Manichaeans in which he attempts a refutation of Mani's dualism.<sup>9</sup> Evodius analyses the problem of evil which lies at the root of the whole question, and endeavors to prove that the source of evil is will and not nature, and to show the inconsistencies of Mani's teaching. He says:

<sup>6</sup> εἰ τις ἀκολουθεῖ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν (the prophets of the Old Testament), ἀποθήσκει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, δεδεμένος εἰς τὸν βῶλον, ὅτι οὐκ ἔμαθε τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ παρακλήτου (Beeson, p. 19).

<sup>7</sup> This particular could perhaps give a clue to the date and place of origin of the Latin version. There would have been no doubt that the *Acta* were originally written in Greek and not in Syriac, as appears by the simple comparison of the Syriac text with the Greek fragments found in Epiphanius (*Panarion*, *Haeresis* 66), if Jerome had not created an embarrassing problem by stating (*De viris illustribus* 72): "Archelaus episcopus Mesopotamiae librum disputationis suae quam habuit adversum Manichaeum exeuntem de Perside Syro sermone composuit, qui translatus in Graecum habetur a multis." But in spite of this statement scholars in general hold the Greek text to be the original, since the internal evidence is in its favor. It is noticeable, however, that Jerome does not mention the Latin version, which means either that at the time he was writing "*De viris illustribus*" the version was not yet in existence or that it had not come to his knowledge.

<sup>8</sup> Evodius, as we know from Augustine's *Epistle* 162, 2, was one of the interlocutors in the two dialogues "*De Quantitate Animae*" and "*De Libero Arbitrio*," written by Augustine in 388, in both of which his anti-Manichaean reaction is vividly manifest. Also the questions which Evodius submits to Augustine in *Epistles* 158, 160, 161, 164 (see also *Ep.* 169), deal with anthropological problems. Dom Morin has published another letter of Evodius addressed to Valentine of Hadrumetum, written in 426 and concerning the doctrine of grace (*Revue Bénédictine*, 1896 and 1901). See Bardenhewer, *Geschichte d. altkirchlichen Literatur*, IV, p. 467).

<sup>9</sup> *De fide contra Manichaeos*; published by Zycha in the Vienna *Corpus*, volume XXV, which contains the anti-Manichaean writings of Augustine.

Mani himself could not deny that souls, even those which according to him belong to the substance of God, sin by their own will. . . . In his Epistle of the Foundation<sup>10</sup> he speaks thus of those souls which for love of the world have experienced the wandering away of their primitive luminous nature and have made themselves enemies of the holy light, and have openly armed themselves for the destruction of the holy elements and put themselves among the followers of the spirit of fire, harassing with their pitiless persecution the holy church and the elected ones who were members of it observing the celestial precepts, and being finally expelled from the bliss and glory of the holy ground. And because they have suffered defeat by evil, they shall remain in the same evil race, and the land of peace and the region of immortality shall be closed to them. This will happen to them because they so entwined themselves with evil works as to estrange themselves beyond hope from the life and freedom of the holy light. On this account they cannot be received in the kingdoms of peace, and they shall be submerged in that horrible lump (*globus*) mentioned above, upon which, however, a guard must necessarily be set. To these realities, therefore, the souls which heard them will adhere, all delivered to the same dark globe, and deserving such a destiny. Because they did not take care to think about these prospects but turned away their eyes when they were in condition to do otherwise.

It is evident that in the Manichaean document written in Latin which Evodius had under his eyes the term βῶλος of the Greek was translated by 'globus.'

And yet when (after the year 405) Evodius was writing his polemical treatise,<sup>11</sup> his teacher and friend Augustine had

<sup>10</sup> A comparative analysis of the divergencies and similarities of the various families of the extant Manichaean texts is an undertaking still in its beginnings. Many additions of new texts have been made during recent years; the Arabic and Syriac texts have been printed, and new texts have been found in the Far East. A tentative classification of the sources has been attempted by P. Alfarc, *Les Écritures Manichéennes*, Paris, 1918. But perhaps the author was too optimistic in his hope of finding a way to harmonize these discordant witnesses to the Manichaean tradition. On the other hand he was too easily influenced by the example of the ancient ecclesiastical polemic writers who associated and almost identified Gnosticism, Mandaeanism, and Manichaeism. So far as concerns the Manichaean literature to be found in the West at the time of Augustine, I think that on comparing the fragments which have survived with the Eastern sources it becomes evident that these latter were subjected to a process of adaptation and often of deformation by the Western writers or translators. An attempt to compare some of the Western and Eastern sources with the aim of reconstructing the original form of a specific tradition is to be found in my study, 'La prima coppia umana nel sistema del Manicheismo' (*Rivista degli studi Orientali*, VII), in which I tried to trace the origin and meaning of the Manichaean cosmogony and its account of the origin of man, together with the story of the seduction of the Archons and the eating by them of their own abortive offspring.

<sup>11</sup> This treatise is posterior to Augustine's "De natura boni contra Manichaeos."

already learned from Ambrosiaster, and had employed at least ten years earlier, the term 'massa' in the same meaning in which the term βῶλος was used in the Manichaean sources. Augustine, revising his old Manichaean experience, had elaborated it in a new formulation which was capable of Christian interpretation.

In reading the passages from Augustine in which the word 'massa' appears, we must clearly distinguish those in which the term is merely a direct quotation or a reminiscence of the New Testament term φύραμα and its equivalents in the Latin versions, from those passages in which Augustine uses the word and the thought involved in it as a formulation of his own theological concept. When, for instance, in the "Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistula ad Romanos," he writes: "Quamdiu figmentum es (o homo), inquit, et ad massam luti pertines, nondum perductus ad spiritualia, ut sis spiritualis, omnia iudicans et a nemine iudiceris, cohibeas te oportet ab huiusmodi inquisitione, et non respondeas deo" (62), he evidently derives, as is shown by the word of quotation ('inquit'), the term 'massa' and the meaning of it from one of the several versions of the New Testament in use at that time. The Greek φύραμα of the original text, as appears from a statement in a later work of Augustine himself, was usually translated in those Latin versions either by 'massa' or by 'consparsio.'<sup>12</sup> But when Augustine expounds in didactic form his own elaboration of the anthropological and soteriological thought of Paul, and makes use of the image implied in the term 'massa' to point out the amorphous compound in which the souls of the wicked are amalgamated, as for instance in Quaestio 68, 3 of "De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus," he goes much

<sup>12</sup> Ep. 186, 19: "ista vero vel conspersio, vel sicut in plerisque codicibus legitur, massa, quoniam tota mortis est." Priscillian also had said: "Scriptura dei res solida, res vera et nec ab homine electa sed homini de deo tradita, cuius si delibatio sancta est et massa sancta est" (Liber de fide et de apocryphis, ed. Schepps, 20). Jerome's Vulgate has also 'massa,' and for ἀπαρχή has 'delibatio.' But evidently in this case Jerome keeps the reading of the Old Latin, for in other cases he prefers to translate ἀπαρχή by 'primitiae,' and φύραμα by 'conspersio' (see his Comm. in Ep. ad Galat., 5, 9).

farther than the formulation of a simple paraphrase of the Pauline clause.<sup>13</sup> What he really does in these and similar passages is to clothe in Pauline language a concept which was fundamentally Manichaean. To be sure, it was Ambrosiaster who gave the first suggestion for such a connection between the two ideas,<sup>14</sup> but it was Augustine who, led by his own peculiar experience, finally identified the Pauline 'massa' with the Manichaean conception of *βῶλος*.

Everyone who is familiar with the high value assigned by Augustine to metaphors in his ideographical descriptions of spiritual realities, will see at once the far reaching importance and the implications of this comparison of mankind to a contaminated 'massa' in the whole development of Augustinian theology and in its bearing on practical Christian life. The anti-pelagian controversy afterwards caused the bishop of Hippo to bring more and more close together his revived Manichaean pessimism and his radically dualistic anthropology so as to formulate a Christian soteriology under the influence of the Pauline metaphor of the potter and the clay.

But in Paul's thought this metaphor was merely a pedagogical phrase and a graphic touch in his exhortation to believers not to be proud and not to cherish unreasonable hopes on account of racial or historical privileges. In Augustine's teach-

<sup>13</sup> For instance in *Quaestio* 68, 3, he writes: "Ex quo in paradiso natura nostra peccavit, non secundum spiritum, sed secundum carnem, mortali generatione formamur, et omnes una massa luti facti sumus, quod est massa peccati. Cum ergo meritum peccando amiserimus, nihil aliud, peccantibus, nisi aeterna damnatio debetur." And in "De diversis quaest." i. 16: "Tunc facta est una massa omnium, veniens de traduce peccati et de forma mortalitatis. . . . Sunt igitur omnes homines una quaedam massa peccati, supplicium debens divinae summaeque iustitiae, quod sive exigatur, sive donetur, nulla est iniquitas." The notion of 'massa' is here very similar to the notion of the *βῶλος* in which the sinners are absorbed to suffer an eternal punishment. And it is important to notice that here Augustine speaks of a 'peccatum naturae,' exactly the opposite of Evodius's point in speaking of evil as having a voluntary and not a natural origin.

<sup>14</sup> Commenting upon Rom. 5, 12, Ambrosiaster wrote: "in quo, id est in Adam, omnes peccaverunt. Ideo dixit, in quo, cum de muliere loquebatur, quia non ad speciem retulit sed ad genus. Manifestum itaque est in Adam omnes peccasse, quasi in massa: ipse enim per peccatum conceptus, quod genuit omnes nati sunt sub peccato. Ex eo, igitur, cuncti peccatores qui ex ipso sumus omnes."

ing, on the contrary, the metaphor becomes a reality, an absolute and final statement of the destiny of human kind which had its premises and its counterpart in the Persian dualism.

There is nothing more instructive than to follow the development of Augustine's anthropological formulations through his works. By taking them in their chronological order we see how the Manichaean conception which had sunk deep into Augustine's consciousness comes gradually and more and more openly to the surface under the pressure of the controversy which led him to an open acknowledgment and a clearer formulation of the doctrine underlying his thought.

While in his book "*Expositio quarumdam propositionum*" the Pauline clause is merely quoted with no personal comments and no attempt to assign to it a different and deeper content, on the contrary in the book "*De diversis quaestionibus*" and in the treatise "*De quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*," we find that the 'massa' of sinful mankind is already equivalent to the *βῶλος* of the Manichaean phraseology. But up to that point Augustine had not yet seen all the implications of such an identification, and above all he had overlooked the necessary link which connected this with other Manichaean conceptions, or at any rate he had not yet succeeded in translating these conceptions into such formulation as to make them compatible with the premises of Christian anthropology and soteriology. A step further may be noticed in the "*Enarrationes in psalmos*," where the metaphor occurs, still in a general form, but with new elements that show a more definite turn of the writer's mind.<sup>15</sup> It is in the fundamental treatise, "*De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*," that the Manichaean implications finally burst out in a tentative synthesis with the Christian system. Augustine had found an explanation for the puzzling problem of original sin in the 'concupiscentia carnalis' which accompanies the act of reproduction and is the channel and

<sup>15</sup> For instance, in the "*Enarratio in Ps. LXII*": "*Fecisti hominem, dedisti ei liberum arbitrium, in paradiso collocasti, praeceptum imposuisti, mortem si praeceptum violaret iustissimam denuntiasti; nihil non fecisti, nemo est qui a te amplius exigat: peccavit, factum est genus humanum tanquam massa peccatorum, profluens de peccatoribus: quid ergo, tu si massam istam iniquitatis damnes, quisque tibi dicet: iniuste fecisti?*"

the cause through which the sin of Adam assumes concrete reality in every child of man.<sup>16</sup>

In his Epistle to Paulinus of the year 417, which is really a theological program, Augustine, commenting anew on the passage Rom. 9, 20–21, rejects altogether the interpretation of 'massa' as a human conglomeration morally neutral, and states in the most outspoken terms that the original defection of Adam made of mankind a 'massa' radically and fatally wicked.<sup>17</sup> But it is above all in his polemical writings against Julianus of Aeclanum that Augustine, harassed by the urgent argumentative strength of his able opponent, betrays the deep anthropological pessimism with which his soul and his religious experience were saturated. In the "Contra Julianum" and in the "Opus

<sup>16</sup> ii. 38: "Sic autem argumentantur dicentes: Ergo malum sunt nuptiae et non est opus dei homo quem generant nuptiae? Quasi nuptiarum bonum sit motus concupiscentiae in quo uxores diligunt qui ignorant deum, quod apostolus prohibet; ac non potius pudicitia coniugalitatis, qua in bonos usus ordinate filios procreandi redigitur libido carnalis: aut vero possit esse homo nisi opus dei non solum qui de coniugio, verum etiam qui de fornicatione vel de adulterio procreatur. Sed in hac quaestione ubi quaeritur non cui rei creator, sed cui salvator sit necessarius, non intuendum est quid boni sit in procreatione naturae, sed quid in peccato mali quo certum est vitiatam esse naturam. Simul autem utrumque propagatur, et natura et naturae vitium; quorum est unum bonum alterum malum. Illud de conditoris largitate sumitur, hoc de originis damnatione attrahitur: illi est causa bona voluntas dei summi, huic mala voluntas hominis primi; illud indicat deum creaturae institutorem, hoc indicat deum inoboedientiae punitorem. Denique idem ipse Christus propter illud creandum factor est hominis, propter hoc sanandum factus est homo." It may seem at first sight that this passage implies a clear condemnation of the Manichaeon doctrine that generation is the work of the evil power; but in reality such is not the case: on the contrary we find in Augustine's ideas a close correspondence with Manichaeon anthropology. As a matter of fact the latter assumed that the sexes were created by the lord of darkness to prevent the imprisoned Light from being rescued, but at the same time it taught also in the myth of the redemption of the Archons that even through the sexual instincts elements of Light could become free and be redeemed.

<sup>17</sup> Ep. 186, 18: "Haec massa si esset ita media, ut quemadmodum nihil boni ita nec mali aliquid mereretur, non frustra videretur iniquitas, ut ex ea fierent vasa in contumeliam; cum vero per liberum arbitrium primi hominis in condemnationem ex uno universa defluerint, procul dubio, quod ex ea fiunt vasa in honorem, non ipsius iustitiae, quae gratiam nulla praecessit, sed dei misericordiae, quod vero in contumeliam, non iniquitati dei, quae absit ut sit apud deum, sed iudicio deputandum est. Hoc quisquis cum ecclesia catholica sapit, non contra gratiam pro meritis disputat, sed misericordiam et iudicium domino cantat, ut nec misericordiam recuset ingratus nec iudicium accipiet iniustus." Here undoubtedly 'massa' is completely identical with βῶλος, that is to say, a conglomeration of perversity.

imperfectum" mankind is for him nothing but a "massa perditionis," out of which only those few who are elected by God emerge to light by virtue of the gift of free grace, extricate themselves from the thick darkness in which they were glued, and reach finally the port of salvation.<sup>18</sup>

The larger and more detailed knowledge that we possess today of the Manichaean system makes possible for us a closer investigation of its divergencies from and affinities with the ecclesiastical theology as it was developed and had assumed definite form in the fourth century. And on the other hand, following step by step the itinerary of its propagation, in spite of the strong opposition, we can understand better the far reaching importance of its extraordinary success.<sup>19</sup> We thus realise that Manichaeism, on both the doctrinal and the practical side, followed like a shadow in the footsteps of orthodox Christianity, which very often could only overcome it by absorbing and making its own some of the Manichaean fundamental conceptions. There are a whole series of significant and instructive instances which lead us to conclude that Christian society, reacting against the natural deformation introduced into Christian life by the "conversion" of Constantine and the consequent new system of relations between the church as a spiritual reality and the world, turned for assistance to the conceptions and practice of Persian dualism. The oldest formula of abjuration imposed upon the Manichaeans, which goes back to the time of Justinian,<sup>20</sup> employs a wealth of disparaging adjectives in anathematizing Mani, who, however, as Epiphanius had remarked, was the founder of the first

<sup>18</sup> *Contra Julianum*, iv. 8, 46; v. 4, 14; vi. 24, 25. The second of these passages is especially important: "Quamvis ergo omnes ex eadem massa perditionis et damnationis secundum duritiam cordis sui et cor impenitens, quantum ad ipsos pertinet, thesaurizant sibi iram in die irae, quo redditur unicuique secundum opera sua: deus tamen alios inde per misericordem bonitatem adducit ad poenitentiam, alios secundum iustum iudicium non adducit." And in the "Opus imperfectum," i. 127: "Gratia liberat a totius massae damnatione quos liberat, quam vos negando estis haeretici." See also i. 136; iv. 131.

<sup>19</sup> E. de Stoops, *Essai sur la diffusion du Manichéisme dans l'Empire romain*, Ghent, 1909.

<sup>20</sup> Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, I. Appendix.

ascetic community.<sup>21</sup> All through the fourth century cenobitism and in general the preaching of continence had been exposed to periodical attacks as Manichaean institutions,<sup>22</sup> but a direct study of the official theology, which in the fourth century underwent so rapid and substantial an evolution, might lead to a better appreciation of the influence exercised over it by Mani's dualistic pessimism. Such a study might bring about a complete revision of our judgment upon the whole Christian history of the fourth century.

At least there is no doubt that the two most remarkable conceptions of Augustine, the greatest western theologian, that is to say his anthropological doctrine and his interpretation of history expounded in the "De civitate dei," are both based on a dualistic view of human nature and human history, according to which the individual as well as the collective life of men is centered in the highly dramatic effort of light and goodness to free themselves from the βῶλος of universal corruption and misery. Both of these are fundamentally Manichaean conceptions. The use of the term 'massa' reveals in the very language of theology the connection that links the epoch-making Augustinian formulation to preceding Manichaean thought.

When we reflect that from the beginning of the fifth century to the Reformation and to Jansenism the great crises of Catholic theology have always been connected with the breaking-out of new controversies on the question of Grace, we are tempted to conclude that the triumph of orthodoxy over dualism was more apparent than real, and that perhaps the very vitality of orthodoxy is due mainly to the leaven which the opposite system has added to its organism, and to the survival in Christian thought and life of but slightly disguised Manichaean premises.

<sup>21</sup> Panarion, Haer. 67.

<sup>22</sup> Jerome himself did not escape the charge of Manichaean tendencies, and Priscillian was altogether a victim of the anti-Manichaean opposition.



## A NINTH-CENTURY COMMENTATOR ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

M. L. W. LAISTNER

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THE subject of this paper, Christian of Stavelot, though he is one of the less familiar figures of the Carolingian revival of learning, whose only substantial work is a commentary on the First Gospel, should be of interest to any student of monastic education. Yet, apart from an admirable essay by Ernst Dümmler and a shorter, but very useful, article by Manitius, recent research has not paid much attention to this writer.<sup>1</sup> A study of his commentary throws a good deal of light on the methods followed by commentators of that age in compiling their expositions of the Scripture, as well as on the system of teaching adopted in the monastic schools. Not the least remarkable characteristic of Christian is his independent spirit, which contrasts markedly with the slavish adherence to earlier authorities noticeable in some of his contemporaries. Indeed the sentiments expressed by Christian at the beginning of his epistle dedicatory are such as to arouse the interest of the reader at once in the man and his work. He says:

I have aimed to follow the historic rather than the allegoric (*spiritalem*) meaning, because it seems to me illogical to look for an allegorical understanding in any book and to ignore the historical utterly; for history is the foundation of all intelligence and we must seek her from the first and embrace her, and without her we cannot successfully pass on to other knowledge.<sup>2</sup>

The known facts of Christian's life are few. Sigebert of Gembloux (end of the eleventh century) calls him a native of Aquitania, and this statement has been generally accepted,<sup>3</sup> but it

<sup>1</sup> E. Dümmler in *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin Academy, 1890, pp. 935 ff.; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur im Mittelalter*, I, p. 431. For the mss. of Christian's work, see J. Lebon, *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, IX, 1908, pp. 491 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The epistle dedicatory is included among the letters published in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae*, VI, pp. 177 f.

<sup>3</sup> So by Dümmler and Manitius. The identification of Christian with Druthmar of Corbie has long been exploded; for this topic see Dümmler, p. 936.

is probable that Sigebert merely deduced this from a single passage in Christian's commentary.<sup>4</sup> More is to be said for the view that he came from Burgundy, for several passages in his work support it.<sup>5</sup> When he wrote his commentary he was a monk in the abbey of Stavelot, and with the help of internal evidence the date of that sojourn can be fixed in the second half of the ninth century. The abbey of Stavelot was situated in what at that time was wild and dangerous country — *in locis vastae solitudinis in quibus caterva bestiarum germinat*<sup>6</sup> — in the heart of the Ardennes. Originally in the diocese of Maastricht, it was later in that of Liège. It had been founded between 648 and 651 at the same time as the neighboring religious house of Malmédy, both being for long under the rule of a single abbot. The founder of Stavelot, St. Remaclus, was a native of Aquitania, and in due course became abbot of Cougnon in the diocese of Trèves. Later he was appointed head of the newly founded religious settlement in the Ardennes. The rule of St. Columban was at first followed in Stavelot, but later — there would appear to be no evidence for determining the precise date of the change — the rule of St. Benedict was introduced, and Christian himself was a staunch admirer of that saint.<sup>7</sup>

In Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, volume 106, we find under Christian's name a lengthy commentary on Matthew and two very brief "Expositiones" on Luke and on John. The genuineness of these two short tracts is open to grave doubt. Dümmler inclined to accept them as genuine, but thought them to be first drafts for a longer work. It has, however, since been pointed out that the two so-called expositions are made up of extracts from the commentaries of Bede and Augustine.<sup>8</sup> That most of

<sup>4</sup> Col. 1379D, where Christian contrasts the attitude of the Vascones and Spaniards with that of the Franks on the subject of dancing.

<sup>5</sup> So Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, II, p. 565, note 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Diplomata*, I, 22 (diploma of King Sigebert II of the year 648).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Gallia Christiana*, III, 939; Hauck, I, p. 270.

<sup>8</sup> J. Lebon, *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, IX, 1908, p. 453. Lebon leaves the authorship of the two expositions undecided. It is significant, too, that of the four extant mss. which contain the commentary on Matthew, two omit both the tracts,

the extracts deal with allegorical interpretation, if it shows anything, suggests that Christian was not the man who made these excerpts. In his genuine work allegorical interpretation, though by no means lacking, is assigned a subordinate place, for he is true to his own declaration in the preface quoted above. Nor does the fact that Christian, in the same preface or dedicatory epistle, indicates that he may, if the commentary on Matthew be a success, follow it up by composing treatises on the Third and Fourth Gospels, prove that the two short tracts that have come down to us are his work. The matter is really immaterial, because the degree of Christian's excellence as an expositor and teacher can be appraised solely from his large commentary.

A passage from the epistle dedicatory has already been quoted; Christian there further tells us that he has undertaken to expound the First Gospel, because the younger members of the abbey, after two readings of the Gospel according to Matthew, are still ignorant of it. Jerome's commentary is too advanced for these beginners in theology, and Christian has tried to be as simple in his exposition as possible, since, he says, it is folly, when expounding any book, to speak in such a way that the commentary requires another commentator to explain it. Allegorical interpretation, he continues, must therefore be a secondary consideration. If his work be a success, he will write commentaries on Luke and John, but Bede's on Mark has made another on that gospel superfluous. Augustine on the Fourth Gospel is again too difficult for beginners, and of Bede's treatise on Luke, Christian had only seen, he says, *quasdam homilias*.<sup>9</sup> The modesty and good sense of this introduction at once predispose the reader in the author's favor. In Dümmler's excellent essay several aspects of Christian's work have hardly received sufficient attention, and some further inquiry into these may be of value. The points in question are the sources used by Christian, his method of compilation and composition, and in connection with this topic the nature of the

and one omits the commentary on John. Besides Dümmler, Hauck also accepts the tracts as genuine (*Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie*, art. 'Druthmar').

<sup>9</sup> It must remain an open question whether Christian's comment on *parascene* (col. 1496B) is indebted to Bede on Luke 23, 54 or to Hrabanus, who copies Bede exactly.

Bible text used by him and the extent of his knowledge of the Greek language.

A number of commentaries on the First Gospel had been composed before Christian's time, for example Jerome's, that attributed to Bede, and the lengthy expositions of Hrabanus Maurus and Paschasius Radbertus. Of these four works Jerome's is basic, a composition in fact on which all subsequent commentators relied. Christian studied it carefully and used it extensively, as is proved by what he himself says in his introduction, by occasional references to Jerome by name, and by a general comparison of the two commentaries. The commentary on Matthew now included among the works of the Venerable Bede need not detain us, since it has been conclusively shown that, so far from being a genuine work of the great English scholar, it is a very abbreviated and not too successful adaptation of the commentary of Hrabanus Maurus.<sup>10</sup> That Christian used Radbertus there seems to be no proof whatever, but it does seem probable that he was not unfamiliar with the work of Hrabanus. It might be thought a simple task to demonstrate such indebtedness, but in reality it is far from easy for two reasons. First, Christian, unlike Hrabanus himself, adapts rather than copies his authorities and in adapting allows himself considerable freedom and adds what is clearly expository matter of his own. Again, in most of the passages where there is some degree of correspondence between the two, we find that Jerome's exposition formed the basis of both, Hrabanus generally copying word for word. As Christian used Jerome's commentary at first hand — this is indisputable — such passages prove nothing for the question whether he used Hrabanus. Again, when Christian comments on Matthew 21, 21 (*si monti huic dixeritis tolle et iacta te in mare, fiet*), he relates a story about Gregory of Nazianzus, who, wishing to build a church in a certain place situated between a rock and a mountain, prayed to God that the mountain might recede. In the morning his prayer had been fulfilled (1435 A). Now this miracle is told by Bede in commenting on Mark 11, 23, a pas-

<sup>10</sup> A. E. Schönbach, 'Ueber einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters,' Sitzungsberichte, Vienna Academy, philosophisch-historische Klasse, CXLVI, no. 4, 1903.

sage that contains the same teaching of Christ, and Hrabanus copies this verbally from Bede, when explaining Matthew 21, 21. Nevertheless, in view of Christian's glowing eulogy on Bede's commentary on Mark in his epistle dedicatory, it seems safe to assume that Christian used Bede directly. When all such passages where an earlier writer has been used are eliminated, the remainder in which it is possible to trace a correspondence between Christian and Hrabanus is small. Yet it is sufficient to show that Christian did occasionally consult the work of the older author, without however being greatly indebted to it.<sup>11</sup> The question of dependence by one author on another is really a very difficult one, as can be illustrated by an error made even by so careful a scholar as Hauck. He asserted that Christian had used the "Collectiones" of Smaragdus (early ninth century) on the New Testament, on the evidence of a single sentence that occurs in both writers.<sup>12</sup> What Hauck failed to observe was that precisely the same sentence is to be found also in Hrabanus, and that all three presumably took it from Jerome, where it first occurs.

Christian is much indebted to Isidore's "Etymologies," though Dümmler's remarks on this indebtedness go too far.<sup>13</sup> The interpretation of Hebrew names, especially in the first chapter of Matthew, can in part be found in Isidore; but a considerable number of them, given by Christian with their interpretations, is not in Isidore. They stand, however, in Jerome's treatise, "De nominibus Hebraicis," and it seems a reasonable hypothesis that this book was accessible to Christian.<sup>14</sup>

The number of passages on other topics where Christian is indebted to Isidore is very considerable, but only in a rela-

<sup>11</sup> Some examples of correspondence between the two commentators may here be given: Christ. 1335A, Hrab. 873D; Christ. 1340A, Hrab. 882D; Christ. 1380D, Hrab. 961B-C (cf. however Rufinus xi. 28); Christ. 1490B, Hrab. 1137A-B.

<sup>12</sup> Realencyclopädie f. protest. Theol., art. 'Druthmar.'

<sup>13</sup> Dümmler, p. 942.

<sup>14</sup> See also the exhaustive work, with full indexes, by F. Wurtz, *Onomastica Sacra* (Harnack and Schmidt, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ser. 3, vol. XI), 1915. An alternative hypothesis would be that Christian used some list of *Onomastica sacra*, similar to that contained in Cod. Vat. Reg. 215; for this see my article in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Manchester, VII, 1923, pp. 446 ff.

tively small number of cases does he copy him verbally. Three such passages arouse our special curiosity, because they seem to give a hint of the type of Isidore manuscript available in the Stavelot library. They are the comments on *theriaca*, on *lepra*, and on *furtum*.<sup>15</sup> In each of these passages in Christian we meet with readings in the Isidore quotations that are found only in a Leyden manuscript of that author (Voss. lat. F 74, called *C* by W. M. Lindsay in his edition of the Etymologies) from the hand of the first corrector. Nothing appears to be known about the history of this manuscript before the beginning of the seventeenth century, when it was in the possession of Gruter;<sup>16</sup> but, as there had apparently once been a fair library at Stavelot,<sup>17</sup> it is conceivable that this manuscript was formerly there. Its date, according to the latest editor of Isidore, is the 9th or 10th century (the first corrector seems to be contemporary or nearly so); it would, however, be interesting, if the manuscript could be reëxamined, first, to ascertain whether a slightly earlier date could be assigned to it on palaeographical grounds, and, secondly, to see whether the codex furnishes any clue to its original provenance.

References in Christian to other patristic writings are few. Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Origen (doubtless in a Latin version) are appealed to on certain points.<sup>18</sup> Among historical writers, Josephus (again, no doubt, in a Latin translation) is mentioned by name in several instances, and this work was

<sup>15</sup> *Theriaca* in 1292B; Isid. Etym. xii. 4, 11 ('pastilli,' codd. Isid.: 'partelli,' C<sup>1</sup>: 'pastelli,' Christ.). *Lepra* in 1325B; Isid. iv. 8, 11 ('lepidae herbae similis,' codd. Isid.: 'lapide,' C<sup>1</sup>: 'lapidi similis,' Christ.). *Furtum* in 1389B; Isid. v. 26, 18 ('a furvo, id est fusco, vocatum,' codd. Isid.: 'furco,' C<sup>1</sup>: 'dictum est a furto, id est nigro,' Christ.).

<sup>16</sup> P. C. Molhuysen (De Navorscher, XLIX, 1899, p. 591) leaves it uncertain whether this manuscript was one of those that Suffridus Sixtinus got from Gruter's library and that passed later into Voss's hands, or whether it reached Voss through some other channel.

<sup>17</sup> The Royal Library at Brussels contains manuscripts that were once at Stavelot (see for possible early examples W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, p. 448). A seventh-century ms. of Orosius, of which only a few leaves have survived, was once at Stavelot. Since the note in the ms. which gives this information is written in a fifteenth-century hand, we cannot tell whether this is the ms. actually used by Christian in the ninth century. See the preface of Zangemeister's edition of Orosius, p. xi.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. generally Dümmler, pp. 941 ff.

used in other passages without acknowledgment; but in some cases Christian quoted him at second hand, merely reproducing the reference that he found in Jerome. Solinus and Orosius are specifically named only once each, but the use of them can be traced in other passages.<sup>19</sup>

The commentary repeats a number of anecdotes from Roman history, the source of which Dümmler briefly indicated as Aurelius Victor and Eutropius. But the matter is not quite so simple and deserves a little further elucidation. In the first place, Aurelius Victor's "Liber de Caesaribus" was not used by Christian, but only the epitome of that work. The epitome was compiled at the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth, century by an unknown author, and contains sundry anecdotes not to be found in Victor. It is one or two of these that reappear in Christian. For example, there is a story of what Diocletian said when he decided to abdicate from the imperial throne. Orosius too mentions the abdication, but without allusion to the fine vegetable-garden which Diocletian said was awaiting his attention when he retired into private life.<sup>20</sup> Another anecdote in Christian relates a story of the emperor Valerian and his captor, the Persian king Sapor.<sup>21</sup> This is told both by the epitomist of Victor and by Orosius. Internal evidence makes it probable here that Christian followed Orosius. Again, there are two stories of the emperor Titus; one of these is certainly from Eutropius, the other either from that author or from the epitomist of Victor.<sup>22</sup> We see then that Christian had access to Orosius, Eutropius, and the epitomist of Victor, but that it is not always possible to tell with certainty which source he used in a given passage. Finally, there is a somewhat unpleasant story of Flamininus, who gratified the sadistic proclivities of his mistress by executing a prisoner before her eyes

<sup>19</sup> For instance, the remark on the hyena's habit of frequenting tombs (1453B) is probably based on Solinus, ed. Mommsen, p. 135, 16. The solitary reference to Orosius by name (1454D) is to his history generally, not to a particular incident in it.

<sup>20</sup> 1323D; Epitome 39, 6; Orosius, vii. 25, 14.

<sup>21</sup> 1448C; Epitome, 32, 6; Orosius, vii. 22, 4. The occurrence of the word 'ad-clivis' in Christian and 'adclinis' in Orosius makes it probable that Orosius was the source.

<sup>22</sup> 1379C, cf. Eutropius, vii. 21, 4 (verbal quotation); 1323D, cf. Eutropius vii. 21, 3 and Epitome 10, 9.

at a banquet, and was subsequently expelled for this act from the senate. Not so terrible a sin, says our commentator, as the offence of Herodias and her daughter. Dümmler overlooked the fact that this story is cited by Jerome, whence Christian took it over. It appears also in the tract of uncertain authorship, "De viris illustribus."<sup>23</sup> Christian had access too to a Latin version of Eusebius's history,<sup>24</sup> and he refers from time to time to the lives of saints and to the passions of certain apostles; for example, St. Peter, Saints Celsus and Martinus, St. Lambert, and St. Leger. We are not surprised to find St. Lambert (Lampertus) among the saints named, for during his earthly life he had been bishop of Maastricht, and had also spent seven years in retreat at Stavelot, where his memory was no doubt cherished with the utmost piety. St. Leger (Leodegarius), again, had played a prominent part in Burgundian politics; if the assumption that Christian came originally from Burgundy be correct, his interest in this saint becomes more intelligible.<sup>25</sup> There is also a reference to a certain martyr who, when he was being tortured, exclaimed "I am the wheat of God, I am being ground by the teeth of wild beasts."<sup>26</sup> C. Weyman, in a review of Dümmler's essay, identified this martyr as St. Ignatius, pointing out that the citation is to be found in the letter to the Romans attributed to that saint (chap. 4).<sup>27</sup> But the story found its way also into Jerome's "De viris illustribus";<sup>28</sup> and yet it seems unlikely that Christian took the story from either of these sources, unless he was quoting from memory something that he had read long before. Otherwise we should have expected him to refer to St. Ignatius by name, and not to have told the story vaguely about *quidam martyr*. A few lines of poetry are to be found scattered here and there

<sup>23</sup> 1380B-C; Jerome on Matt. 14, 11; cf. De vir. illust. 47, 4. This story seems to have originated with the notorious Valerius Antias, and then to have been frequently repeated by Roman historical writers, including Livy. See fragment 48 of Valerius and H. Peter's note in *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, I (2nd ed.).

<sup>24</sup> We may compare, for instance, 1378C with Rufinus i. 11, and 1380D with Rufinus xi, 28 (but, as pointed out above, Christian may here be following Hrabanus).

<sup>25</sup> St. Lampertus and St. Leodegarius are named together in 1305A.

<sup>26</sup> 1294A-B.

<sup>27</sup> *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XI, 1890, p. 805.

<sup>28</sup> Jerome, De vir. illust. 16.

through Christian's commentary, drawn from Sedulius, Juvenecus, and the *Disticha Catonis*.<sup>29</sup> There are, besides, three citations from Vergil, one from Juvenal, one from Martial, and one from the Latin Anthology, but with regard to these a word of caution is necessary.<sup>30</sup> Two of the Vergilian quotations, and those from Martial and Juvenal, are cited by Isidore in the *Etymologies*, and the context in which they are found in Christian leaves no room for doubt that he took them from Isidore. The remaining Vergilian quotation is *Eclogue* 4, 7; one cannot of course deny that Christian had access to Vergil and read him; but it cannot be proved, for he may well have got this line also from an intermediate source. Similarly, the line from the Latin Anthology is quoted, not in the form in which it appears in the best manuscripts, but as cited by a sixth-century grammarian.<sup>31</sup> This seems to be significant.

It is when we analyse Christian's commentary, apart from the question of sources, that we find something unique in it for

<sup>29</sup> Sedulius, *Carm. pasch.* v. 188–195 in 1490A; v. 322–325 in 1500A. Juvenecus i. 241 in 1281B; *Dist. Cat.* i. 17, 2 in 1438D.

<sup>30</sup> Vergil: 1267C, *Ecl.* 10, 67 (*Isid.* vi. 13, 3); 1302B, *Aen.* iv. 174 (*Isid.* v. 27, 26); 1427B, *Ecl.* 4, 7; Martial, xiv. 73 (*Isid.* xii. 7, 24) in 1347D. The line from Juvenal (14, 139, *Isid.* i. 36, 11) is cited three times, 1373C, 1404B, and 1418C.

<sup>31</sup> *Anthol. Lat.* 256, 2, in 1330A; it is cited in the same form as in Cassiodorus, *De orthographia* (Keil, *Gramm. Lat.* VII, 156). The remaining verse citations in Christian are two from Bede and one from the Sibyl. The Bede quotations are:

Nulla erit suspicio  
Salutis vel remedii,  
Janua clausa thalami  
Completi sponsi nuptiis (1464D);  
O quam infelix anima  
Privata hoc convivio,  
Quae ultra in memoriam  
Non revertetur domini (1465A).

These verses do not appear to be found in any of the extant poems attributed to Bede. The line from the Sibyl, which is quoted immediately after the verse from the fourth *Eclogue*, reads:

E coelo rex adveniet Christus per saecula futurus (1427B).

It looks as if Christian, or rather his source, had in mind *Oracula Sibyllina*, iii. 286,

καὶ τότε δὴ θεὸς οὐρανόθεν πέμψει βασιλῆα καὶ τότε ἀπ' ἡελίου θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα

(cf. also iii. 652, which is quoted by Lactantius, vii. 18). I am indebted for these three references to Professor Nathaniel Schmidt.

the time at which it was written. It is couched in simple language and contains much elementary teaching on grammar, because the author never forgot that he was instructing beginners and that some words in the Bible were no longer clearly understood by the illiterate in the ninth century. Thus Christian explains that *proficiscens* is the present participle of a deponent verb (1465C), and to the phrase *mi pater*, he adds *mi vocativus possessivi est, a meo veniens* (1478D). *Sata dicuntur seminata* he writes in another place (1361D), for, as glossaries show us, in ordinary speech *serere* had gradually been displaced by *seminare* (Fr. 'semer').<sup>32</sup> There are scarcely any rare words in the commentary and, to us a matter for regret, only one trace of the vernacular. This single passage in which a Germanic word occurs is of some interest; Dümmler, though he cites the passage in a footnote, does not appear fully to have understood it.<sup>33</sup> Commenting on the sentence, "a reed shaken by the wind" (Matt. 11, 7), Christian equates *arundo* with *canna*, following Isidore (Etym. xvii. 7, 57); then he adds one of those touches of local color that are a token of his excellence as a teacher:

Such reeds abounded in Judaea just as they do in Italy, so that they make fences out of them and other necessary objects, and they grow in marshy places *in modum herbae quae apud nos ros vocatur* (1355B).

So the text in Migne and no doubt in the manuscript followed by the editor: but does it mean anything? Surely what Christian wrote was *ror* (O. H. G. '*rôr*'; Mod. Germ. '*Rohr*'); this makes good sense, and any one who is even slightly familiar with final R and final S in certain types of eighth-century and ninth-century minuscule, will recognise how easy it was for a scribe to make the mistake in copying (especially after the preceding *nos*). It is a pity that there are not more references to the vernacular, such as occur, for example, in his contemporary, Martin of Laon. Christian's method of exposition is, as already indicated, unusual for the time at which he wrote. Though he makes extensive use of Jerome's commentary and

<sup>32</sup> Similarly in 1317D, to the quotation (Matt. 6, 26), "*Respicite volatilia caeli, quomodo non serunt*" he adds "*id est seminant.*" The Migne editor printed these three words in italics, as though they were part of the citation.

<sup>33</sup> Dümmler, p. 938, note 6.

of Isidore's Etymologies, it is generally his practice not to copy his source verbally, as was done by Hrabanus, but to give in his own words the gist of what his sources contain, and usually that is the same as to say, in simpler language. Again the method of the good teacher is apparent. He adds touches of his own too; for instance, in an excursus on visions and prophecies (1277B-D), which seems to be based on Isidore (Etym. vii. 8, 33), some of the examples he gives, as well as the order in which he classifies different kinds of such manifestations, appear to be wholly his own. Similarly, in the classification of the *tria genera philosophiae* (1266B-D) based on Isidore (Etym. ii. 24), some of the illustrative matter is not to be found in the earlier writer.<sup>34</sup> In commenting on the two robbers on Calvary (1491C), Christian has clearly consulted Jerome on the passage;<sup>35</sup> but it is his own comment that the repentant robber had the three virtues of faith, hope, and charity, doubtless a conscious reminiscence of 1 Corinthians, chapter xiii, on the part of the commentator. The robber had faith because he believed that the Lord would reign; hope, because he adjured Jesus in the words, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom"; charity, because he reproved his fellow robber for reviling Christ.

Christian knew his Bible well, and reminiscences, tacit or expressed, for the purpose of illustrative comparison, are many. Thus the suicide of Judas Iscariot reminds him of Achitophel's self-murder by hanging (2 Sam. 17, 23);<sup>36</sup> while we are provoked to a smile when Christian, speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem in the forty-second year after the Lord's ascension, goes on to say that this time was given to the Jews, and "because they refused to repent, two bears, Vespasian and Titus, came forth from the forest of the Gentiles (*de saltu gentilium*) and slew 1,100,000 of them and took 100,000 prisoners."<sup>37</sup> Clearly Christian had the story of Elisha and the

<sup>34</sup> 'Logica,' which is first spelled correctly, then appears twice as 'loyca.' Is this merely a scribe's carelessness or an indication of the way in which the word was then pronounced?

<sup>35</sup> Jerome on Matt. 27, 44.

<sup>36</sup> 1485C.

<sup>37</sup> 1493D.

children of Bethel in mind, and it was fortunate that even the number forty-two fitted in, though rather awkwardly; there are two bears and forty-two children in the tale (2 Kings 2, 23 f.).

Reference has already been made to what may be called touches of local color in the commentary. Thus, in annotating the words *et iussit eos discumbere supra fenum*,<sup>38</sup> Christian remarks:

During the summer in these lofty mountains grass customarily grows in abundance, a similar sight to that which is familiar to those who have sojourned in our Alps. And, as the distance from cities and villages was great, for that reason no man cut it.

Again he contrasts the season at which thunder occurs in the eastern countries with the time of the year at which it may be expected in that part of the world where he lives.<sup>39</sup> More than once he refers to the poverty and woodland-character of the neighboring regions, comparing them to the wealth and resources of Palestine. The social conditions of the time cause Christian to strike more than once the note of pessimism and reprobation:<sup>40</sup> he compares many clerics and laymen of his day to wolves, because of their injustice and rapacity, and there are many other like criticisms scattered through the commentary.

A matter of some interest, which has not received the attention that it deserves, is the nature of the biblical text used by Christian. The citations from the gospels and elsewhere are of course printed in italics in Migne's edition; but the editing has been carelessly done, so that in a number of instances words that are part of Christian's annotation have been printed as though they were biblical quotations. This adds to the difficulty of determining the nature of Christian's biblical text, and a critical edition of the commentary is needed before anything like a final estimate can be formed. Nevertheless some con-

<sup>38</sup> Matt. 14, 19 (where the reading is 'et cum iussisset'); Christian's comment is in 1382D.

<sup>39</sup> 1369A.

<sup>40</sup> For these passages and others it is sufficient to refer to Dümmler's very full analysis (pp. 943 ff.).

clusions can safely be drawn. If the citations from Matthew in Christian's work are carefully collated with a critical text of the Hieronymic version, two things will be noticed: <sup>41</sup> first, Christian occasionally conflates his text by adding or substituting words from one of the other gospels, where these narrate the same event or parable as Matthew. Secondly, there are a good many divergences from what is probably the true text of Jerome's translation. With regard to the first matter, an illustration or two will help to make the point clear. In the story of the healing of the paralytic, the Latin text of Matthew is *surrexit et abiit in domum suam*.<sup>42</sup> In Christian the quotation appears thus: *surrexit et tulit in quo iacuerat et abiit in domum suam*, a version which adds a detail from Luke. Again, in Jerome's translation of Matt. 12, 25, we read *omne regnum divisum contra se*; in Christian <sup>43</sup> the citation appears as *omne regnum in se ipsum divisum*, which is actually Luke's version of the same phrase. The words *arundinem quassatam non confringet* in Matt. 12, 20, are part of a quotation or transcription of Isaiah 42, 3. Christian however cites the words, not as they appear in the gospel, but as they stand in the original context in Isaiah, *calamum quassatum non conteret*.<sup>44</sup>

The cases where Christian's text diverges from the standard are numerous. In forming the following conclusions the present writer has ignored trifling differences. But even if only the more noteworthy divergences are observed, we get an unmistakable indication of what Christian's New Testament looked like. In nearly a score of cases Christian's readings correspond to those found in the manuscript now called R; in nearly as many instances we find parallels to E. In a smaller number of cases the readings are those also found in D, L, and Q. Now, what are these manuscripts? R is Codex Rushworthianus, now in the Bodleian Library, E is Codex Egertonensis in the British Museum, D is the famous Book of Armagh, Q the equally well-

<sup>41</sup> Wordsworth and White's text of the gospels has been used throughout, and for the Greek text of the New Testament the edition of von Soden.

<sup>42</sup> Matt. 9, 7; Christian 1334A; Lk. 5, 25 (*tulit lectum in quo iacebat*).

<sup>43</sup> 1366B, Lk. 11, 17.

<sup>44</sup> 1365B.

known Book of Kells, and L is Codex Lichfeldensis, the so-called Book of St. Chad. All these manuscripts contain what biblical scholars call an Irish text. Wordsworth and White, while they are cautious about the origin of this recension, agree that DELQR form a clearly defined group of manuscripts and add: "In these we frequently recognize corrections made from Greek codices and readings of great value. It would not be difficult therefore to construct the Irish recension of Jerome's Vulgate from these and similar manuscripts."<sup>45</sup> There can be no doubt, then, that the manuscript of Matthew used by Christian belonged to this Irish family of manuscripts,<sup>46</sup> but to assume from this that at some time there was considerable Irish influence at Stavelot, or even the presence of Irish monks there, is hazardous in the absence of more definite evidence. Still, it should be remembered that in the early days of the abbey the monks followed the Rule of St. Columban and that later Stavelot was in the diocese of Liège. And in the early part of the ninth century there was an Irish colony at Liège, the most illustrious member of which was Sedulius Scotus. Finally there is one characteristic of Christian which at once suggests that he, at all events, came under Irish influence at some stage of his career — he knew some Greek.

Dümmmler and others would seem to have underestimated Christian's knowledge of that language.<sup>47</sup> What is the evidence provided by the commentary? Near the beginning of it (1265D–1266A) Christian, after some remarks on the composition of the four gospels, in which he is probably adapting Isidore (Etyim. vi. 2, 35–39), tells us that he had seen gospels which were supposed to have belonged to St. Hilary and in which the order of the four gospels was unusual, namely, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark.<sup>48</sup> He goes on:

<sup>45</sup> *Novum Testamentum Latine* ed. Wordsworth and White, praef. p. x.

<sup>46</sup> The more important variants have been set out in a short appendix at the end of this paper.

<sup>47</sup> Traube's opinion of Christian's Greek was somewhat more favorable, because of Christian's remarks on the abbreviation of the name Jesus (1278C–D). See L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, p. 6.

<sup>48</sup> This is of course the regular "Western" order of the gospels, as found in Codex Bezae, Codices Vercellensis (a), Veronensis (b), Brixianus (f), Palatinus (e), and many

*Interrogavi enim Euphenium (Euphemum?) Graecum cur hoc ita esset: dixit mihi: in similitudinem boni agricolae, qui quos fortiores habet boves primo iungit.*

This Euphemus may of course have been a Greek, as his name, if genuine, suggests; but the fact that he is called 'Graecus' need not by itself mean more than that he knew some Greek. For 'Graecus' is a sobriquet applied to Irishmen who had some acquaintance with that language.<sup>49</sup> The 'Graeca' in Christian's commentary are in the main single words, for which the Latin equivalent is given, with or without a further explanation. A goodly number of such words with their Latin equivalents are derived from the two sources to which Christian owed most, Jerome and Isidore.<sup>50</sup> But even when all these words are eliminated from the list, a fair residue of knowledge remains for which Christian himself deserves the credit. He distinguishes between ὁσιος and ἅγιος,<sup>51</sup> explains carefully the principle on which the name Jesus is abbreviated,<sup>52</sup> gives the derivations of ἐπιφάνια and θεοφάνια.<sup>53</sup> In another place a distinction is drawn between προσκυνῆσαι and κλίνειν;<sup>54</sup> this appears to be Christian's own, although in the passage which immediately follows he is indebted to Isidore. The quotation λατρεύειν αὐτῷ is also given correctly from Luke 1, 74. Occasionally Christian makes blunders, but the derivation of Haceldema from ἀγρός and αἶμα is no worse than many etymological experiments in Isidore and elsewhere.<sup>55</sup> He cites the words ἀπὸ τοῦ

other Old Latin mss., as well as in some Greek codices; see Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, II, pp. 370 f.; Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, II, pp. 854 f. On Hilary's use of a text not unlike the sixth-century Irish Codex Usserianus (r), see A. Souter, *Text and Canon of the New Testament*, pp. 87 f.

<sup>49</sup> We may instance the Irish bishop who came to Bavaria and who is called 'Tuti Grecus' (Meichelbeck, *Historia Frisingensis*, II, 91) and also 'Dobda Grecus' (M. G. H. *Script.* XI, p. 6). Wattenbach, in his note on the latter passage, cites a charter of Charlemagne in which the name appears as 'Dodo Grecus peregrinus.' At all events there is no doubt that the bishop was an Irishman. A further instance we find in the 'Ellenici fratres' at St. Gall; cf. J. M. Clark, *The Abbey of St. Gall*, 1926, pp. 109-111.

<sup>50</sup> One or two instances will suffice: the explanations of εὐνοῦν (1309B), ἐπιούσιον (1314D), κυλλούς (1391D), are all from Jerome, those of λατρεῖα (1299D) and 'paropsis' (1443D) are derived from Isidore.

<sup>51</sup> 1276D.

<sup>54</sup> 1299C.

<sup>52</sup> See note 47, above.

<sup>55</sup> 1486B.

<sup>53</sup> 1286A-C.

Καίφα (the name is given in Roman characters) correctly from John 18, 28, but with more logic than grammatical accuracy calls this an ablative.<sup>56</sup> The equation of 'dormitorium' with κοιμητήριον he may have found in a glossary,<sup>57</sup> but we are impressed by a philological note in which he explains how an initial aspirate in Greek appears as initial s in the corresponding Latin word.<sup>58</sup> Finally, there are three passages which strongly confirm the general impression formed from the evidence already given, that Christian knew a good deal of Greek and used a Greek New Testament.

1. Commenting on Matt. 16, 22, where Peter rebukes Christ, Christian quotes the Greek version in this form: "ἰλεώθητί σοι, quod est, propitius esto tibi" (1398C). We should say that he was copying Jerome, but Jerome cites the words as they are now found in the passage "Ἰλέως σοι, κύριε." No authority for Christian's reading is known, and it is probable that Christian was quoting from memory. But if he was, the use of the imperative of the aorist passive of a verb argues some familiarity with the grammar of the Greek language.

2. Neither Jerome, Bede, Hrabanus, nor Radbertus gives the Greek version of the Aramaic *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani* (Matt. 27, 46) spoken from the Cross. Christian quotes the Greek in the following form: <sup>59</sup> ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με. This rendering does not correspond exactly to what we find in either the first or the second gospel, but is a combination of the two.<sup>60</sup> In fact, the form he cites of this Greek sentence shows the same conflation that has already been noted in the case of some of his quotations from the Latin.

3. Christian also quotes another saying from the cross,<sup>61</sup> the sentence, *Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum*, which does not occur in Matthew, but only in Luke 23, 46.

<sup>56</sup> 1481D.

<sup>57</sup> 1493C; cf. Corp. Gloss. Lat. V, 430, 22 (a Eusebian gloss).

<sup>58</sup> 1498A.

<sup>59</sup> 1492B.

<sup>60</sup> Matt. 27, 46 θεέ μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες. Mk. 15, 34, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με (so codd. A E F G K P T Δ H and many others; ἐγκατέλιπές με is the order of NBL and a few others).

<sup>61</sup> 1492D.

The Greek words in Christian's version read thus: *εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου*. Here *παραθήσομαι* (a correction after the Greek text of Psalm 30, 6, as against the better reading *παράθεμαι* of codices B<sup>2</sup>AC KMPQUXII and others) shows that Christian is using the text of codices EGHLSVΔΔ and others, that is, the text of the group held by von Soden to represent the oldest form of the Antiochian, or Lucianic, text (K).<sup>62</sup>

When we bear in mind that, in the passages just indicated, Christian is, so far as can be ascertained, quite independent of earlier commentators, who either do not quote the Greek version at all or quote it in a different form, and when we add this strong evidence to the by no means negligible indications of Greek scholarship in the rest of the commentary, we are led to the conclusion that he belonged to that very small band of ninth-century scholars who really had a practical knowledge of Greek and not merely a small vocabulary of Greek words derived from Isidore or from some glossary.

It is always a fascinating, if dangerous, pastime to form a picture of a man for ourselves from his writings, dangerous, especially, if he lived in an age remote from our own. Christian we should judge to have been an earnest yet kindly disciple of St. Benedict; not untypical of his age in his judgments on women<sup>63</sup> and on wine;<sup>64</sup> charitable to the poor and to humbler folk in general; intolerant of the oppressor, and withal a teacher of exceptional ability and, for that age, of unusual originality. Among the lesser scholastic figures of the Carolingian Age he deserves to be assigned a foremost place.

<sup>62</sup> Presumably C. Weyman had this passage in mind when he referred to Christian's exposition as "anknüpfend an die Traditionen der antiochenischen Exegetenschule" (Histor. Jahrb. XI, 1890, p. 805).

<sup>63</sup> "Curiosum animal est femina et ardens novitate" (1483C).

<sup>64</sup> "Quod non est vitium, si moderate potetur (sc. vinum)" (1358B).

# APPENDIX OF READINGS FROM THE LATIN TEXT OF MATTHEW

In the first table (A) is given a selection of readings as they appear in the Vulgate (Wordsworth and White's edition) and in Christian respectively. Correspondences of Christian's readings with one or more of the Irish group of mss. are indicated by the usual symbols for the Vulgate codices. Other codices such as Epternacensis, cited by Wordsworth and White, which occasionally agree with the Irish group, have been ignored.

In the second table (B) some of the more important divergences of Christian's text which seem not to be attested in existing mss. of the Vulgate, are set out. In many cases these variants seem to be due to conflation with the version in another gospel, and in these cases a reference to this other source has been added. A study of the Old Latin codices might show the source of some, perhaps many, of these harmonizations.

<i>Vulgate</i>	A	<i>Christian</i>
Matt.		
3, 10 radicem	1293A	radices (DLR)
3, 12 permundabit	1294A	mundabit (L)
5, 18 amen quippe dico	1306D	om quippe (om R)
5, 38 quia dictum est	1311C	quia dictum est antiquis (Q)
6, 29 quoniam nec Salomon	1318C	quia nec Salomon (DEL)
8, 12 regni	1327D	regni huius (DELQR)
9, 17 rumpuntur; effunditur	1337D	rumpentur; effundetur (rumpentur LR: effundetur DELQ; cf. Lk. 5, 37)
9, 35 omnem infirmitatem	1342D	omnem infirmitatem in populo (R)
10, 13 revertatur	1348A	revertetur (DLQR)
10, 18 et ad praesides et ad reges	1348C	et ad reges et praesides (ER; cf. Lk. 21, 12)
12, 9 transisset	1364A	transiret (DE)
12, 29 domum illius	1367A	domum eius (DE)
13, 11 mysteria	1372B	mysterium (misterium DEQ)
13, 16 quia; quia	1372D	qui (LQR); quae (LR)
13, 24 simile factum est	1374A	simile est (ER)
13, 33 farinae	1375B	farina (DQR)
13, 47 congreganti	1376D	congregati (Q)

14, 21 mulieribus et parvulis	1383D parvulis et mulieribus (E)
16, 27 secundum opus eius	1400D secundum opera sua (opera DLQR; sua R)
17, 5 bene	1402D <i>om</i> bene ( <i>om</i> L)
17, 12 quia Helias	1403D quod Elias (E)
18, 18 ligata et in coelo	1410C ligata et in coelis (EQ)
21, 23 docentem	1435C <i>om</i> docentem ( <i>om</i> R)
21, 25 e coelo <i>bis</i>	1435C-D de caelo <i>bis</i> (E)
22, 26 similiter secundus et tertius usque ad septimum	1443C similiter duo et tres usque ad septem (II et III usque ad VII D)
22, 40 universa lex	1445B tota lex (R; Radbertus 757D)
24, 20 ut non	1457A ne (R)
24, 27 paret	1458A apparet (DQR)
24, 29 commovebuntur	1458D movebuntur (E; cf. Mk. 13, 25)
24, 30 parebit	1458D apparebit (DEQR)
24, 33 haec omnia scitote	1459D haec fieri scitote (E)
24, 44 fur venturus esset	1461D fur veniret (E; cf. Lk. 12, 39)
24, 50 manducet; bibat	1462D manducat; bibit (R)
25, 14 sicut enim	1465B <i>om</i> enim ( <i>om</i> LR)
25, 30 illic	1469B ibi (E)

## B

<i>Vulgate</i>	<i>Christian</i>
Matt.	
2, 4 congregans	1282C convocans
5, 12 quoniam merces	1305B ecce enim merces (Lk. 6, 23)
5, 33 iterum audistis quia dictum est	1310C <i>om</i> audistis quia
5, 34 ego autem dico vobis non iurare omnino	1311A nolite iurare
5, 35 est pedum eius	1311B pedum eius vocatur
5, 41 f. ( <i>These verses are transposed</i> )	1314C quotidianum (Lk. 11, 3; <i>below</i> <i>in the exposition Christian uses</i> <i>supersubstantialis</i> )
6, 11 supersubstantialem	1318B nostrum
6, 27 vestrum	1318D Deus tali decore vestit ( <i>Is tali</i> <i>decore merely the interpretation of</i> <i>Christian?</i> )
6, 30 deus sic vestit	1320B inveniet
7, 8 invenit	1320B lapidem dabit illi (Lk. 11, 11)
7, 9 lapidem porriget ei	1331C et clamabant
8, 29 et ecce clamaverunt	1334A et surrexit et tulit in quo iacue- rat et abiit in domum suam (cf. Lk. 5, 25, tulit lectum in quo iacebat)
9, 7 et surrexit et abiit in domum suam	1335C <i>om</i> venientes (cf. Mk. 2, 14)
9, 10 venientes discumbebant	1337B commissuram panni rudis mit- tit in vestimentum
9, 16 f. inmittit commissuram panni rudis in vestimentum	1338A adoravit ( <i>also in some codices,</i> <i>cf. Wordsworth and White, ad. loc.</i> )
9, 18 adorabat	

- 10, 11 donec exeatis  
 10, 14 receperit; audierit; exeuntes  
     foras de domo vel de civitate ex-  
     cutite pulverem de pedibus vestris  
 11, 1 et praedicaret  
 11, 21 factae essent  
 12, 25 omne regnum divisum contra  
     se  
 12, 33 fructum. . bonum; fructum. .  
     malum  
 13, 4 f. quaedam ceciderunt secus  
     viam; alia autem ceciderunt in  
     petrosa  
 13, 7 alia autem ceciderunt  
 13, 19 venit malus et rapit  
 13, 20 f. super petrosa; accipit; in se  
 13, 54 in patriam suam  
 13, 54 synagogis  
 14, 3 posuit in carcerem  
 14, 7 postulasset  
 14, 19 et cum iussisset turbam dis-  
     cumbere  
 14, 20 tulerunt  
 14, 23 et dimissa turba ascendit in  
     montem solus orare. vespere au-  
     tem facto solus erat ibi  
 14, 26 et videntes eum supra mare  
     ambulantem turbati sunt dicentes  
     quia phantasma est  
 14, 35 et cum cognovissent eum viri  
     loci illius  
 14, 36 et quicumque tetigerunt  
 15, 9 mandata  
 15, 29 sedebat ibi  
 15, 35 praecepit turbae ut discumbe-  
     ret  
 15, 37 omnes; plenas  
 16, 26 detrimentum patiatur  
 17, 14 filio meo  
 17, 25 vel censum  
 21, 28 habebat  
 22, 7 civitatem illorum  
 23, 23 graviora sunt  
 1347C om donec exeatis (cf. Lk. 10, 7)  
 1348A receperint; audierint; exeuntes  
     excute pulverem de pedibus vestris  
     in testimonium illis (Mk. 6, 11)  
 1353C om et praedicaret  
 1358D factae fuissent (Lk. 10, 13)  
 1366B omne regnum in se ipsum divi-  
     sum (Lk. 11, 17)  
 1368A fructus. . bonos; fructus. . malos  
     (cf. Lk. 6, 43)  
 1371C-D aliud cecidit secus viam;  
     aliud cecidit super petram (Lk. 8,  
     5 f.)  
 1372A aliud cecidit (Lk. 8, 8)  
 1373A venit diabolus et tollit (Lk. 8,  
     11)  
 1373B super petram; suscipit (cf. Lk.  
     8, 13, om in se)  
 1377B in terram suam  
 1377B synagoga (cf. Mk. 6, 1)  
 1379B religavit in carcere  
 1379D postulare  
 1382D et iussit eos discumbere  
 1383C sustulerunt (Mk. 6, 43)  
 1384A vespere solus erat ibi. ipse as-  
     cendit solus verticem montis orare et  
     discipuli laboraverunt in mari in  
     remigando tota nocte (cf. Mk. 6, 48)  
 1385B-C et videntes eum supra mare  
     ambulantem putaverunt phantasma  
     esse (cf. Mk. 6, 49)  
 1386C cognoscebant autem dominum  
     de frequenti visione (*this seems to be*  
     *a paraphrase by Christian*)  
 1386C et quotquot tangebant  
 1387D om mandata  
 1391C erat ibi  
 1392C praecepit turbae discumbere  
 1392D om omnes; om plenas  
 1400A detrimentum faciat (cf. Lk. 9,  
     25, detrimentum sui faciat)  
 1404A mei filii (*also in some codices,*  
     *cf. Wordsworth and White*)  
 1406C om vel censum  
 1436A habuit  
 1440A civitatem illam  
 1450A maiora sunt

- |        |   |       |  |
|--------|---|-------|--|
| 24, 6  | haec fieri  | 1454D | haec primum fieri  |
| 24, 7  | consurget   | 1455A | surget   |
| 24, 14 | veniet consummatio                                      | 1456A | erit consummatio   |
| 24, 22 | breviati fuissent                                       | 1457C | abbreviati essent (adbreviati<br>T; cf. <i>Wordsworth and White</i> )                            |
| 24, 34 | dico vobis quia non praeteribit                         | 1460A | om quia non  |
| 25, 32 | segregat  | 1469D | separat  |
| 26, 3  | et seniores populi                                      | 1472A | om et seniores populi  |
| 26, 17 | accesserunt discipuli ad Iesum<br>dicentes              | 1475A | accesserunt discipuli eius Pe-<br>trus et Andreas (cf. Lk. 22, 8, et<br>misit Petrum et Ioannem) |
| 26, 68 | prophetiza nobis, Christe, quis<br>est qui te percussit | 1483B | si propheta es, dic per prophe-<br>tiam quis est qui te percussit                                |

